

## REMARKS

### INTRODUCTION:

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 16 and 17 have been cancelled, claims 20 and 21 have been added and claims 10, 13, 15 and 18 have been amended.

Claims 1-21 are pending and under consideration. Claims 1, 10, 12, 13, 15, 18, 19 and 20 are independent claims. Reconsideration of the claims in light of the present amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

### ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER:

Claims 16 and 17 are objected to but are indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claims 16 and 17 have been cancelled. However, new claim 20 incorporates the features of claim 15 and cancelled claim 16, while claim 21 incorporates the cancelled features of cancelled claim 17. Claims 1-9, 14, 12 and 19 are allowed.

### REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC 102 & 103:

Claims 15 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by US Pat. No. 7,161,897 to Davies et al ("Davies"). Claims 10, 11, 13, 15 and 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Davies in view of US Pat. No. 6,977,937 to Weinstein et al. ("Weinstein"). Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Davies in view of Weinstein and further in view of US Pat. No. 7,245,640 to Kwiatkowski ("Kwiatkowski"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections for at least the following reasons.

Amended independent claim 10 recites at least the following features:

storing, according to a predetermined dynamic routing protocol,  
link state information of a router, which has a domain name service  
server in a network subnet to which the router belongs, in a link  
state advertisement of the router

Davies, Weinstein and Kwiatkowski, alone or in combination, fail to suggest or disclose at least all of the above-recited features. The Office Action notes, at page 4, first paragraph, that "Davies does not disclose link state advertisement of the router, flooding procedure." However, the Office Actions looks to modify Davies with Weinstein, and asserts that Weinstein describes

the above-recited features. Applicants respectfully disagree with this assertion. The portion of Weinstein cited in the Office Action states:

“According to a first aspect of the present invention, each router in a radio network having a plurality of routers comprises a memory storing a routing table, and a receiver for receiving link state information from the network” (col. 2, lines 1-4).

Weinstein is directed to a radio network routing apparatus for mobile network routing (col. 1, lines 6-10). The cited portion of Weinstein describes a router having a receiver for receiving link state information from the network. This is not the same as “storing ... link state information of a router,” as claimed above. Moreover, the cited portion of Weinstein fails to even mention “a link state advertisement of the router.” Accordingly, Weinstein fails to suggest or disclose at least all of the above-recited features.

Further, Kwiatkowski fails to compensate for the deficiencies of Davies and Weinstein.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 10 patentably distinguishes over Davies, Weinstein and Kwiatkowski, and should be allowable for at least the above-mentioned reasons. Since similar features recited by independent claims 13, with differing scope and breadth, are not taught or disclosed by Davies, Weinstein and Kwiatkowski, the rejection should be withdrawn and claim 13 also allowed. Claim 11, which depends from and includes all of the features of independent claim 10, should be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 10, as well as for the additional features recited therein.

Amended independent claim 10 further recites at least the following features:

transmitting the link state information of the router having the domain name service server in the router subnet, and stored in the link state advertisement, to all routers within an autonomous system to which the router belongs, through a flooding procedure of the predetermined dynamic routing protocol, wherein all of the routers within the autonomous system transmit router advertisement (RA) messages including the link state information of the DNS server to predetermined hosts which ask for a location of the DNS server, thereby automatically setting an address of the DNS server on the predetermined hosts

Davies, Weinstein and Kwiatkowski, alone or in combination, fail to suggest or disclose at least all of the above-recited features. The Office Action notes at page 6, item 4, that “the prior art of record does not teach advertising by the requesting router having received the reply,

a router advertisement message containing the address of the domain name service server to a subnet to which the requesting router having received the reply belongs...”

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 10 patentably distinguishes over Davies, Weinstein and Kwiatkowski, and should be allowable for at least the above-mentioned reasons. Since similar features recited by independent claims 13, 15 and 18, with differing scope and breadth, are not taught or disclosed by Davies, Weinstein and Kwiatkowski, the rejection should be withdrawn and claim 13, 15 and 18 also allowed.

Claim 11, which depends from and includes all of the features of independent claim 10, should be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 10, as well as for the additional features recited therein.

#### NEW CLAIMS:

New independent claim 20 and new dependent claim 21 have been added. Claim 20 incorporates the features of claim 15 and cancelled claim 16, while claim 21 incorporates the features of cancelled claim 17. Applicants note that claims 16 and 17 were indicated as allowable in the current Office Action, and therefore claims 20-21 should be allowable for at least the same reasons. Consideration of the new claims is respectfully requested.

#### REQUEST FOR INTERVIEW BEFORE NEXT OFFICE ACTION:

If the present rejections are to be maintained, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney to discuss the pending claims before issuance of the next Office Action. Applicants believe that a more thorough review of the pending claims will be helpful in furthering prosecution.

#### CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

Serial No. 10/808,607

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: April 8, 2008

By: 

David J. Gufitta  
Registration No. 52,790

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501